

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 and 32 are pending in this application. Claims 1-23 are withdrawn for consideration. Claims 24-30, and 32 are rejected.

Claim 31 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Claims 33-44 are newly added.

Support for the above amendments appears throughout the originally filed specification, claims, and drawings

Applicant, by amending any claims herein, makes no admission as to the validity of any rejection made by the Examiner against any claim. Applicant reserve the right to reassert any of the claims canceled or the original claim scope of any claim amended herein, in a continuing application.

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments to the claims introduce no new matter within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §132. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections for the reasons discussed below.

I. Claims 24-30 and 32 stands under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duret et al. (US 4,053,126).

The Examiner asserts that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have inserted and removed the mold core in any selected direction relative to the metal reinforcing element as long as the core remained stationary in the mold throughout the duration of the molding procedure and was at least

partially removable when the molding procedure was complete to create openings such as doors in the article, as taught by Duret et al. (col. 4, lines 58-63). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

To establish an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), four factual inquiries must be examined. The four factual inquiries include (a) determining the scope and contents of the prior art; (b) ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue; (c) resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and (d) evaluating evidence of secondary consideration. *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966). In view of these four factors, the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be made explicit, and should "identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the [prior art] elements" in the manner claimed. *KSR Int'l. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007). Furthermore, even if the prior art may be combined, there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and the reference or references, when combined, must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Duret et al. disclose metal elements 42 and 43 of the fuselage frame or the tail boom of an aerodyne. See column 5, line 56 thru column 6, line 6.

Duret et al. states:

"The rings 42 and longitudinal 43 which define the resistant frame, are shown in position of assembly, inside the mould, before instruction of the plastics materials therein."

Duret et al. further states:

“After construction of the coating of the structure, the connection between the rings and the longitudinal is effected by coating the longitudinal and peripheral flanges 44 and 45 of these elements, as shown in FIG. 14, which corresponds to line XIV-XIV of FIG. 13. To improve the mechanical characteristics at these connections, cut fibres 46 of highly resistant filaments, e.g. glass, carbon, or boron, are introduced with the charge of plastics material, which thus beomes the support matrix for these local reinforcements.”

The manufacturing of a composite article according to the claimed subject matter is shown in Fig. 11 A, B, C, and D. A mold core 20 is inserted into the metal reinforcing element 12. The mold parts 71, 72 and the metal reinforcing element 12 with the inserted core 20 are assembled so as to fix the metal reinforcing element 12 in the mold cavity.

Plastic coating is injected into the space for the plastic coating to form the composite article 10. The composite article 10 is released from the mold, and the mold core is entirely removed from the composite article 10.

In contrast, Duret et al. does **not** disclose or show a core inserted and removed during the manufacture of the boom assembly, as shown in Fig. 13.

Specifically, the Examiner states that “the metal reinforcing element allows insertion via the open side of the channel of a mold core (43) which is configured to provide mechanical stability to the reinforcing element (fig. 13).” See last four (4) lines of page 2 of the Office Action.

Clearly, the longitudinal stringers 43 are **not** a core according to the claimed subject matter, but instead are a permanent component or part of the final manufactured boom assembly. The longitudinal stringers 43 are **not** removed in any manner, let alone entirely removed from the article.

Thus, nothing in Duret et al. render the subject matter of the of the claims obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §103. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

If an extension of time is necessary to prevent abandonment of this application and is not filed herewith, then such extension of time is hereby petitioned for under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a). Any fees required for further extensions of time and any fees for the net addition of claims are hereby authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 14-0112. Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
THE NATH LAW GROUP

/William L. Klima/
Susanne M. Hopkins
Registration No. 33,247
William L. Klima
Registration No. 32,422
Customer No. 20529

June 6, 2011
THE NATH LAW GROUP
112 South West Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703)548-6284